Evolution equation for quantum coherence

Ming-Liang Hu[1,*] and Heng Fan[2,3,†]

[1]School of Science, Xi'an University of Posts and Telecommunications, Xi'an 710121, China
[2]Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics,
Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
[3]Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100190, China

The estimation of the decoherence process of an open quantum system is of both theoretical significance and experimental appealing. Practically, the decoherence can be easily estimated if the coherence evolution satisfies some simple relations. Based on the coherence quantification method, we prove a simple factorization relation for the l_1 norm measure of coherence, and analyze under which condition this relation holds. We also obtain a more general relation which applies to arbitrary N-qubit state, and determine a condition for the transformation matrix of the quantum channel which can support permanently freezing of the l_1 norm of coherence. These results simplify determination of a general decoherence dynamics to that the investigation of evolution about the representative probe state.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn

arXiv:1512.07688v2 [quant-ph] 3 Feb 2016

Introduction.— Quantum coherence, an embodiment of the superposition principle of states, lies at the heart of quantum mechanics, and is also a major concern of quantum optics [1]. Physically, coherence constitutes the essence of quantum correlations (e.g., entanglement [2] and quantum discord [3]) in bipartite and multipartite systems which are indispensable resources for quantum communication and computation tasks. It also finds support in the promising subject of thermodynamics [4–8] and quantum biology [9].

Due to the lack of rigorous coherence measures, researches in this subject were usually limited to the analysis of the decay of the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix, and only qualitative statements are established. Sometimes, behaviors of coherence were also analyzed indirectly via that of various quantum correlations [3]. However, coherence and quantum correlations are in fact different. Very recently, the characterization and quantification of quantum coherence from a mathematically rigorous and physically meaningful perspective has been achieved [10], and this sets the stage for quantitative analysis of coherence. In the past one year, researches in this field mainly center around the establishment of various coherence monotones [10–15] and their calculation [16]. Some other progresses about coherence measures include the revelation of their operational interpretation via entanglement [12, 17] and discord-like correlations [18–20], their frozen in noisy environments [21], their local and nonlocal creativity [22–24], their tradeoffs with other quantum feature measures [25], and the role they played in the fundamental issue of quantum mechanics [26–28].

From a practical point of view, it is vital to make clear the decoherence mechanism of a system when it is subject to the noisy environments. The reason is twofold. First, the subject of decoherence is a fundamental problem of modern physics, and revealing its behavior can help to understand the subtle issue of quantum mechanics from classical world [1]. Second, coherence is a resource for quantum information and computation, but the unavoidable interaction of quantum devices with the environment often decoheres the input state and induces coherence loss, hence damage the superiority of quantum information and computation [29]. Making clear dependence of the decoherence process on structure of an environment can facilitate the design of efficient coherence preservation protocols.

Looking for general law determining the decoherence process of a system is of both theoretical significance and experimental appealing. Remarkably, the evolution equations of certain entanglement monotones (or their bounds) [30–35] and discord-like correlations [36] were found to obey the factorization relation for specific initial states, and this simplifies the assessment of their robustness against decoherence. Then, it is quite natural to ask whether there exist similar relations for the coherence monotones. In this Letter, we aimed at solving this problem. We first classify the general d-dimensional states into different families, and then establish a factorization relation which holds for them. By employing this factorization relation, we further identified condition on the quantum channels for freezing coherence. We also generalized this factorization relation such that it applies to arbitrary N-qubit state. The results are hoped to add another facet to the already rich theory of decoherence, and shed light on revealing interplay between structures of the quantum channel and geometry of the state space, as well as how they determine quantum correlation behaviors of an open system.

Coherence measures.— By establishing rigorously the sets of incoherent states $\mathcal{I}$ which are diagonal in the chosen reference basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1,\ldots,d}$, and incoherent operations $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ICPTP}}$ specified by the Kraus operators $\{E_l\}$ which map all $\delta \in \mathcal{I}$ into $\mathcal{I}$, Baumgratz and coworkers [10] proposed the conditions for an information-theoretic coherence measure C: (1) $C(\rho) \geq 0$ for all states ρ, and $C(\delta) = 0$ iff $\delta \in \mathcal{I}$. (2) Monotonicity under the actions of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ICPTP}}$, $C(\rho) \geq C(\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ICPTP}}(\rho))$. (3) Monotonicity under selective incoherent operations on average, i.e., $C(\rho) \geq \sum_l p_l C(\rho_l)$, where $\rho_l = E_l \rho E_l^\dagger / p_l$, and $p_l = \mathrm{Tr}(E_l \rho E_l^\dagger)$ is the probability of obtaining the outcome l. (4) Convexity, $\sum_l p_l C(\rho_l) \geq C(\sum_l p_l \rho_l)$, with $p_l \geq 0$ and $\sum_l p_l = 1$.

There are several quantifiers which have been shown to be well-defined coherence monotones. They are the l_1 norm, the relative entropy [10], the Uhlmann fidelity [12], and the intrinsic randomness [14]. In this Letter, we concentrate on the l_1 norm of coherence. For a given density matrix ρ and reference basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1,\ldots,d}$, it is defined as [10]

$$C(\rho) = \sum_{i\neq j} |\langle i|\rho|j\rangle|, \tag{1}$$

which equals the summation of the absolute values of the off-diagonal elements of ρ.

General results.— Consider a general d-dimensional state in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The corresponding density matrix can be written as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}\cdot\vec{X}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_d$ is the $d\times d$ identity matrix, $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{d^2-1})$, with $x_i = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho X_i)$. Here, $\vec{X} = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{d^2-1})$, with $X_i \propto T_i$, and $\{T_i\}$ are generators of the Lie algebra $\mathrm{SU}(d)$ [37]. In the defining, or fundamental, representation of $\mathrm{SU}(d)$, they are represented by the $d\times d$ traceless Hermitian matrices, which satisfy $T_iT_j = \delta_{ij}\mathbb{I}_d/2d + \sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1}(if_{ijk} + d_{ijk})T_k/2$, where f_{ijk} are the structure constants that are completely anti-symmetric in all indices, while d_{ijk} are completely symmetric in all indices.

In the computational basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1,\ldots,d}$, elements of $\vec{X}$ can be written explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} &u_{jk} = |j\rangle\langle k| + |k\rangle\langle j|,\ v_{jk} = -i(|j\rangle\langle k| - |k\rangle\langle j|),\\ &w_l = \sqrt{\frac{2}{l(l+1)}}\sum_{j=1}^{l}(|j\rangle\langle j| - l|l+1\rangle\langle l+1|), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $j,k \in \{1,2,\ldots,d\}$ with $j<k$, and $l \in \{1,2,\ldots,d-1\}$. Clearly, $\{X_i\}$ satisfy $\mathrm{Tr}(X_i^\dagger X_{i'}) = 2\delta_{ii'}$. Moreover, the notation i appeared in v_{jk} is the imaginary unit.

For ρ represented as Eq. (2), the l_1 norm of coherence can be derived as

$$C_{l_1}(\rho) = \sum_{r=1}^{d_0}\sqrt{x_{2r-1}^2 + x_{2r}^2}, \tag{4}$$

with $d_0 = (d^2-d)/2$, and $\{X_i\}$ are arranged in the sequence: $\vec{X} = \{u_{12}, v_{12}, \ldots, u_{d-1,d}, v_{d-1,d}, w_1, \ldots, w_{d-1}\}$. Clearly, x_l related to w_l which is diagonal in the computational basis do not contribute to the l_1 norm of coherence.

To investigate decay behaviors of the l_1 norm of coherence, we suppose the considered system traverses a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ specified by the set of Kraus operators $\{E_\mu\}$ satisfying the completeness condition $\sum_\mu E_\mu^\dagger E_\mu = \mathbb{I}_d$. The evolution of this system can then be described by the completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) map [29]

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_\mu E_\mu \rho E_\mu^\dagger = \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}'\cdot\vec{X}, \tag{5}$$



FIG. 1: (Color online) States of the same family $\{\rho^{\hat{n}}\}$ are represented by the characteristic vectors $\vec{x}$ along the same or opposite directions (left). When $\{\rho^{\hat{n}}\}$ traverse a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ (right), their decoherence process can be described qualitatively by that of $\rho_p^{\hat{n}}$ with the unit vector $\hat{n}$ (the bottommost golden one).

where elements of $\vec{x}'$ for $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ are given by $x_i' = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)X_i]$.

Now, we turn to the Heisenberg picture to describe $\mathcal{E}$ via the map: $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_i) = \sum_\mu E_\mu^\dagger X_i E_\mu$. As an arbitrary Hermitian operator $\mathcal{O}$ on $\mathbb{C}^{d\times d}$ can be decomposed as $\mathcal{O} = \sum_{i=0}^{d^2-1} r_i X_i$, ($r_i \in \mathbb{R}$), the map $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_i)$ can be further characterized by the transformation matrix T defined via

$$\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{d^2-1} T_{ij}X_j, \tag{6}$$

where we denote by $X_0 = \sqrt{2/d}\mathbb{I}_d$ hereafter. The elements of T are given by $T_{ij} = \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_i)X_j]/2$ (clearly, $T_{00} = 1$ and $T_{0j} = 0$ for $j \ge 1$). This further gives $x_i' = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_i)] = \sum_{j=0}^{d^2-1} T_{ij}x_j$.

To present our central result, we first classify the states ρ of Eq. (2) into different families $\rho = \{\rho^{\hat{n}}\}$, with

$$\rho^{\hat{n}} = \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\chi\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}, \tag{7}$$

and $\hat{n} = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{d^2-1})$ is a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^{d^2-1}$, while χ is a parameter satisfying $|\chi| \le \sqrt{2(d-1)/d}$ as $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{\hat{n}})^2 = |\chi|^2/2 + 1/d$. By this classification scheme, different families of states are labeled by different unit vectors $\hat{n}$, while states belong to the same family $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ are characterized by a common $\hat{n}$, and can be distinguished by different multiplicative factors χ (see Fig. 1). That is to say, $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ represents states with the characteristic vectors $\vec{x}$ along the same or completely opposite directions but possessing different lengths.

While $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ is fully described by $\chi\hat{n}$, and the action of $\mathcal{E}$ on $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ can be written equivalently as the map $\vec{x}' = \mathcal{E}(\chi\hat{n})$, a quantum property measure Q may only be function of $\chi\hat{n}^s$, i.e., $Q(\rho^{\hat{n}}) = Q(\chi\hat{n}^s)$, with $\hat{n}^s = \{n_k\}_{k=k_1,\ldots,k_\alpha}$ ($\alpha \le d^2-1$) the subset of $\hat{n}$. Then as one can always make $Q_{\max} \ge 1$ (otherwise, one can normalize it by simply multiplying a constant), we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1: For any quantum property measure $Q(\rho^{\hat{n}}) = Q(\chi\hat{n}^s)$ that can be factorized as $Q(\chi\hat{n}^s) = f(\chi)g(\hat{n}^s)$, and quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ that gives the map $\mathcal{E}(\chi\hat{n}^s) = \chi\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)$, the

factorization relation

$$Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})] = Q(\rho^{\hat{n}})Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})], \tag{8}$$

holds, where $f(\chi)$ and $g(\hat{n}^s)$ are functionals of χ and $\hat{n}^s$, respectively, and $\rho_p^{\hat{n}} = \mathbb{I}_d/d + \chi_p \hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}/2$ is the probe state, with χ_p solution of the equation $f(\chi_p)g(\hat{n}^s) = 1$.

The proof is in the Supplemental Material [38]. Equipped with this lemma, we are now in position to present the following theorem.

Theorem 1: If the transformation matrix elements $T_{k0} = 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^2 - d\}$, then the evolution of $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})]$ obeys the following factorization relation

$$C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})] = C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}})C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})], \tag{9}$$

where the probe state $\rho_p^{\hat{n}} = \mathbb{I}_d/d + \chi_p \hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}/2$, with $\chi_p = 1/\sum_{r=1}^{d_0}(n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2)^{1/2}$.

The proof to this theorem is also presented in [38]. Here, we further demonstrate an equivalent form of it. As $T_{k0} = 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^2 - d\}$, we have $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2-1} T_{kj}X_j$, hence $\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_k)] = 0$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_k)] = \mathrm{Tr}(X_k \sum_\mu E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger)$. This, together with Eq. (3), require that elements of $A = \sum_\mu E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger$ must satisfy $A_{ij} \pm A_{ji} = 0$ for $i \neq j$. This gives rise to the following corollary:

Corollary 1: If the summation $A = \sum_\mu E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger$ is diagonal, i.e., $A = \mathrm{diag}\{A_{11}, A_{22}, \ldots, A_{d,d}\}$, then the evolution of $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})]$ obeys the factorization relation of Eq. (9).

This corollary means that in addition to the usual completeness condition $\sum_\mu E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_d$ of the CPTP map, the factorization relation (9) further requires $\sum_\mu E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger$ to be diagonal. For convenience of later presentation, we denote this kind of channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{F}$, Clearly, it includes the unital channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{U}$ [i.e., $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{I}_d/d) = \mathbb{I}_d/d$] as a special case.

From a geometric perspective, Theorem 1 indicates that for all states of the same family $\rho^{\hat{n}}$, namely, states with the characteristic vectors $\vec{x}$ along the same or opposite directions, their decoherence dynamics measured by the l_1 norm can be represented qualitatively by that of the probe state $\rho_p^{\hat{n}}$, as the magnitude of $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{F}(\rho^{\hat{n}})]$ equals the product of the initial coherence $C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}})$ and the evolved coherence $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{F}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})]$. This simplifies greatly the assessment of the decoherence process of an open quantum system.

Moreover, the obtained factorization relation (9) provides a strong link between amount of the coherence loss of an open system and structures of the applied quantum channels. Particularly, as $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with the vectors $\vec{x}$ along the same or opposite directions fulfill the same decoherence law, the geometric approach adopted here may offer a route for better understanding the interplay between geometry of the state space and various aspects of its quantum features. It might also provides a deeper insight into the effects of gate operation in quantum computing and experimental generation of coherent resources in noisy environments, as $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{F}(\rho^{\hat{n}})$ can specify the actions of environments, of measurements, or of both on states $\rho^{\hat{n}}$.

It is also worthwhile to mention that when some restrictions are imposed on the quantum channel, the factorization relation (9) can be further simplified.

Corollary 2: If a channel $\mathcal{E}$ yields $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_k) = q(t)X_k$ for $\{X_k\}_{k=k_1,\ldots,k_\beta}$ ($\beta \leq d^2 - d$), with $q(t)$ containing information on $\mathcal{E}$'s structure, then the factorization relation

$$C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)] = |q(t)|C_{l_1}(\rho), \tag{10}$$

holds for the family of states $\rho = \mathbb{I}_d/d + \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_\beta} x_k X_k/2 + \sum_{l=d^2-d+1}^{d^2-1} x_l X_l/2$.

The proof of this corollary is direct. As $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(X_k) = q(t)X_k$ for $\{X_k\}_{k=k_1,\ldots,k_\beta}$, the parameters x_k' for $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ are given by $x_k' = q(t)x_k$. Therefore, by Eq. (4) we obtain $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)] = |q(t)|C_{l_1}(\rho)$. That is to say, the evolution of the l_1 norm of coherence for $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ is solely determined by the product of the initial coherence and a noise parameter $|q(t)|$.

There are many quantum channels satisfying the condition of Corollary 2. For instance, the Pauli channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{PL}$ and Gell-Mann channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{GM}$ given in Ref. [36], the generalized amplitude damping channel for the one-qubit states [29]. Note that $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{PL}$ covers the bit flip, phase flip, bit-phase flip, phase damping, and depolarizing channels which embody typical noisy sources in quantum information as special cases.

One can also construct quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{G}$ under the action of which $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{G}(\rho)]$ obeys the factorization relation (10) for arbitrary initial state. The Kraus operators describing $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{G}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^\mathrm{G} &= \frac{1}{d}\sqrt{1 + (d^2 - d)q + (d-1)q_0}\,\mathbb{I}_d, \\ E_k^\mathrm{G} &= \sqrt{\frac{1-q_0}{2d}}X_a, \\ E_l^\mathrm{G} &= \sqrt{\frac{1 - dq + (d-1)q_0}{2d}}X_b, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with $k \in \{1, \ldots, d^2 - d\}$, and $l \in \{d^2 - d + 1, \ldots, d^2 - 1\}$, while $q(t)$ and $q_0(t)$ are the time-dependent noisy parameters. Clearly, $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{G}$ includes the depolarizing channel (i.e., $q_0 = q$) as a special case.

N-qubit case.— A general N-qubit state ρ can be written as $\rho = \mathbb{I}_{2^N}/2^N + \vec{y}\cdot\vec{Y}/2$, where $\vec{Y} = \{Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_{4^N-1}\}$, and

$$Y_j = 2^{(1-N)/2}\sigma_{j_1} \otimes \sigma_{j_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{j_N}, \tag{12}$$

with $(j_1 j_2 \ldots j_N)$ taking the values of $(00\ldots1)$, $(00\ldots2)$, $(00\ldots3)$, …, $(33\ldots3)$.

We now show that every family of the N-qubit states $\rho^{\hat{m}} = \mathbb{I}_{2^N}/2^N + \chi\hat{m}\cdot\vec{Y}/2$ [$\hat{m} = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{4^N-1})$ is a unit vector] can be generated by an auxiliary channel $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{aux}$ acting on ρ. To this end, we consider $\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{aux}$ described by the Kraus operators $E_\mu^\mathrm{aux} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_\mu}Y_\mu$, with $\mu \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 4^N - 1\}$ and $Y_0 = \sqrt{2^{1-N}}\mathbb{I}_{2^N}$. Then, by employing the anticommutation relation of the Pauli operators, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_\mathrm{aux}^\dagger(Y_\nu) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{4^N-1} c_{\nu\mu}\varepsilon_\mu Y_\nu, \tag{13}$$

where $c_{\nu\mu}=2^{1-N}(-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{N}\xi_k^{\nu\mu}}$, with $\xi_k^{\nu\mu}=0$ if $\nu_k\mu_k(\nu_k-\mu_k)=0$, and $\xi_k^{\nu\mu}=1$ otherwise. This formula is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}^{\dagger}(Y_\nu)=q_\nu Y_\nu$, with $q_\nu=\sum_\mu c_{\nu\mu}\varepsilon_\mu$ encoding information of $\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}$. To solve $\{\varepsilon_\mu\}$, we introduce the coefficient matrix $\hat{c}=\{c_{\nu\mu}\}$, the column vectors $\hat{\varepsilon}=(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_{4^N-1})^T$, and $\hat{q}=(1,q_1,\ldots,q_{4^N-1})^T$, then $\hat{c}\hat{\varepsilon}=\hat{q}$, and ε can be derived as $\hat{\varepsilon}=\hat{c}^{-1}\hat{q}$. By choosing $q_\nu=\chi m_\nu/y_\nu$, we obtain $y'_\nu=\chi m_\nu$. Therefore, we have the third corollary.

Corollary 3: For any N-qubit state ρ, one can construct a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}$ such that $\rho^{\hat{m}}=\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}(\rho)$.

This corollary, together with Eq. (9), implies that

$$C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_{\rm F}\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}(\rho)]=C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}(\rho)]C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}_{\rm F}(\rho_p^{\hat{m}})], \tag{14}$$

with $\rho_p^{\hat{m}}=\mathbb{I}_{2^N}/2^N+\chi_p\hat{m}\cdot\vec{Y}/2$, $\chi_p=1/\sum_{r=1}^{d_0}(\bar{m}_{2r-1}^2+\bar{m}_{2r}^2)^{1/2}$, $d_0=(4^N-2^N)/2$, and $\bar{m}_i=\sum_j a_{ij}m_j$, with a_{ij} being determined by the transformation between $\{Y_j\}$ and $\{X_i\}$: $X_i=\sum_j a_{ij}Y_j$. This equality generalizes the result of Eq. (9) for the N-qubit states ρ. It shows that the coherence of the evolved state under the actions of two cascaded channels $\mathcal{E}_{\rm F}\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}$ is determined by the product of the coherence for the evolved probe state under the action of $\mathcal{E}_{\rm F}$ and the coherence for the generated state by $\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}$.

As every Y_j in Eq. (12) can always be decomposed as linear combinations of the generators $\{X_i\}$, the above result applies also to the qudit states with $d=2^N$. As an explicit example, the transformation between $\{Y_j\}$ and $\{X_i\}$ for $N=2$ is given in the Supplemental Material [38], from which $\mathcal{E}_{\rm aux}$ and $\{a_{ij}\}$ can be constructed directly.

Frozen coherence.— By Theorem 1 we can also derive conditions on the quantum channel for which the l_1 norm of coherence is frozen. To elucidate this, we return to Eq. (9), from which one can see that $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})]$ is frozen if the coherence of the probe state remains constant 1 during the evolution, i.e., $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})]\equiv 1$. For later use, we denote by T^S the submatrix of T consisting T_{ij} with i ranging from 1 to d^2-d and j from 1 to d^2-1. Then by Theorem 1 and the reasoning in its proof [38], we obtain the fourth corollary.

Corollary 4: If $T_{k0}=0$ for $k\in\{1,2,\ldots,d^2-d\}$, and T^S is a rectangular block diagonal matrix, with the main diagonal blocks

$$T_r^S=\begin{pmatrix} T_{2r-1,2r-1} & T_{2r-1,2r} \\ T_{2r,2r-1} & T_{2r,2r}\end{pmatrix}\ (r\in\{1,\ldots,d_0\}), \tag{15}$$

being orthogonal matrices, i.e., $(T_r^S)^TT_r^S=\mathbb{I}_2$, the l_1 norm of coherence for $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ will be frozen during the entire evolution.

The proof of this corollary is in [38]. It enables one to construct quantum channels for which the l_1 norm of coherence is frozen. As an explicit example, we consider the one-qubit state case, with $\mathcal{E}$ being described by $E_i=\sum_{j=0}^{3}\varepsilon_{ij}\sigma_j$, $i\in\{0,1,2,3\}$ and $\varepsilon_{ij}\in\mathbb{C}$. Then by Corollary 4, one can obtain that when $\varepsilon_{i0}=\varepsilon_{i3}=0$, and $\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i1}+i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2=\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i1}-i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2=[\sum_i(|\varepsilon_{i1}|^2-|\varepsilon_{i2}|^2)]^2+4[\sum_i{\rm Re}(\varepsilon_{i1}^*\varepsilon_{i2})]^2=1$, or when $\varepsilon_{i1}=\varepsilon_{i2}=0$, and $\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i0}+\varepsilon_{i3}|^2=\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i0}-\varepsilon_{i3}|^2=[\sum_i(|\varepsilon_{i0}|^2-|\varepsilon_{i3}|^2)]^2+4[\sum_i{\rm Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^*\varepsilon_{i0})]^2=1$, with ${\rm Re}(\cdot)$ and ${\rm Im}(\cdot)$ representing, respectively, the real and imaginary parts of a number, the l_1 norm of coherence will be frozen [38]. There are a host of $\{\varepsilon_{ij}\}$ that fulfill the requirements, e.g., the simplest case of $\varepsilon_{01}=q(t)$, $\varepsilon_{02}=\pm q'(t)$, $\varepsilon_{i1}=\varepsilon_{i2}=0$, or $\varepsilon_{00}=q(t)$, $\varepsilon_{03}=\pm iq'(t)$, $\varepsilon_{i0}=\varepsilon_{i3}=0$, with $i\in\{1,2,3\}$, $q'(t)=\sqrt{1-q^2(t)}$, and $q(t)$ contains the information on $\mathcal{E}$'s structure and its coupling with the system.

Moreover, for certain special initial states, the freezing condition presented in Corollary 4 may be further relaxed. In fact, for $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with certain $n_{2r-1}=0$ (or $n_{2r}=0$), the freezing condition $(T_r^S)^TT_r^S=\mathbb{I}_2$ simplifies to $T_{2r-1,2r}^2+T_{2r,2r}^2=1$ (or $T_{2r-1,2r-1}^2+T_{2r,2r-1}^2=1$) [38]. For instance, when considering the channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm PL}$ [36], the l_1 norm of coherence for $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with $n_2=0$ is frozen during the entire evolution when $q_1=1$ (i.e., the bit flip channel). Similarly, for $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with $n_1=0$, it is frozen when $q_2=1$ (i.e., the bit-phase flip channel). These are in facts the results obtained in Ref. [21]. Needless to say, when $(T_r^S)^TT_r^S=\mathbb{I}_2$, the l_1 norm of coherence is also frozen for $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with certain $n_{2r-1}=0$ or $n_{2r}=0$.

Finally, we remark that the coherence concurrence $C_z(\rho)$ which is a monotonic function of the intrinsic randomness coherence measure for the one-qubit states [14], and the trace norm of coherence $C_{\rm tr}(\rho)$ for certain special sates [13, 21], coincide with the l_1 norm of coherence. Hence, our results presented in this Letter also apply to them. Moreover, the l_1 norm of coherence is intimately related to the negativity of quantumness [21, 39], and is a monotone of the entanglement-based coherence measure $C_g(\rho)$ for ρ of one qubit [12]. For these limited cases, our results also provide a route for inspecting interplay between peculiar decay behaviors of coherence, quantumness, and entanglement.

Apart from quantum coherence, there are other quantifiers fulfilling conditions of Lemma 1, hence the factorization relation (8) holds. Some examples encompass the purity monotone, the geometric quantum discord [40], the measurement-induced nonlocality [41], the Hellinger distance discord [42], the maximum Bell-inequality violation [43], and fidelity of remote state preparation [44] and quantum teleportation [45] (see [38] for more detail). These manifest again the universality of the factorization relation obtained in this Letter, and will certainly deepen our understanding of the already rich and appealing subject of quantum channels or the CPTP maps.

Summary.— We have established a simple factorization relation for the evolution equation of the l_1 norm of coherence. This relation is of practical relevance for assessing coherence loss of an open quantum system. For a general d-dimensional state, we determined condition such that the factorization relation holds. This condition can be described as a restriction on the form of the transformation matrix, or on the summation of the product $E_\mu E_\mu^\dagger$ of the Kraus operators, of the quantum channel. By introducing an auxiliary channel, we further presented a more general relation which applies to all the N-qubit states. Moreover, we have also determined a condition the transformation matrix should satisfy such that the l_1 norm of coherence for a general d-dimensional state is dynamically frozen, and constructed explicitly the desired quantum channels for states of one qubit. We hope these results may help

in understanding the interplay between structure of the quantum channel, geometry of the state space, and decoherence of an open system, as well as their combined effects on peculiar decay behaviors of various quantum correlations.

This work was supported by NSFC (Grants No. 11205121, 91536108), NSF of Shaanxi Province (Grant No. 2014JM1008), the Youth Foundation of XUPT, and CAS (Grant No. XDB01010000).

* Electronic address: mingliang0301@163.com
† Electronic address: hfan@iphy.ac.cn

[1] Z. Ficek and S. Swain, Quantum Interference and Coherence: Theory and Experiments (Springer Series in Optical Sciences, 2005).
[2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[3] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
[4] J. Åberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 150402 (2014).
[5] M. Lostaglio, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Nat. Commun. **6**, 6383 (2015).
[6] V. Narasimhachar and G. Gour, Nat. Commun. **6**, 7689 (2015).
[7] M. Lostaglio, K. Korzekwa, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 021001 (2015).
[8] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Yunger Halpern, Phys. Rep. **583**, 1 (2015).
[9] N. Lambert, Y. N. Chen, Y. C. Cheng, C. M. Li, G. Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Nat. Phys. **9**, 10 (2013).
[10] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[11] D. Girolami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 170401 (2014).
[12] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).
[13] L. H. Shao, Z. Xi, H. Fan, and Y. Li, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042120 (2015); Y. R. Zhang, L. H. Shao, Y. Li, and H. Fan, *ibid*. **93**, 012334 (2016).
[14] X. Yuan, H. Zhou, Z. Cao, and X. Ma, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022124 (2015).
[15] S. Du and Z. Bai, Ann. Phys. **359**, 136 (2015).
[16] D. P. Pires, L. C. Céleri, and D. O. Soares-Pinto, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042330 (2015).
[17] Y. Yao, X. Xiao, L. Ge, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022112 (2015); D. Girolami and B. Yadin, arXiv:1509.04131.
[18] Z. Xi, Y. Li, and H. Fan, Sci. Rep. **5**, 10922 (2015).
[19] X. Hu and H. Fan, arXiv:1508.01978.
[20] J. Ma, B. Yadin, D. Girolami, V. Vedral, and M. Gu, arXiv:1510.06179.
[21] T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015).
[22] A. Mani and V. Karimipour, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032331 (2015).
[23] X. Hu, A. Milne, B. Zhang, and H. Fan, Sci. Rep. **6**, 19365 (2016).
[24] E. Chitambar, A. Streltsov, S. Rana, M. N. Bera, G. Adesso, and M. Lewenstein, arXiv:1507.08171; M. García-Díaz, D. Egloff, and M. B. Plenio, arXiv:1510.06683.
[25] S. Cheng and M. J. W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042101 (2015).
[26] U. Singh, M. N. Bera, H. S. Dhar, and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052115 (2015); M. N. Bera, T. Qureshi, M. A. Siddiqui, and A. K. Pati, *ibid*. **92**, 012118 (2015); D. Mondal, T. Pramanik, and A. K. Pati, arXiv:1508.03770.
[27] S. Du, Z. Bai, and Y. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052120 (2015).
[28] A. Winter and D. Yang, arXiv:1506.07975.
[29] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
[30] T. Konrad, F. de Melo, M. Tiersch, C. Kasztelan, A. Aragão, and A. Buchleitner, Nat. Phys. **4**, 99 (2008).
[31] O. J. Farías, C. L. Latune, S. P. Walborn, L. Davidovich, and P. H. S. Ribeiro, Science **324**, 1414 (2009).
[32] M. Tiersch, F. de Melo, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 170502 (2008).
[33] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190504 (2010).
[34] Z. G. Li, S. M. Fei, Z. D. Wang, and W. M. Liu, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 024303 (2009); Z. G. Li, M. J. Zhao, S. M. Fei, and W. M. Liu, *ibid*. **81**, 042312 (2010).
[35] C. S. Yu, X. X. Yi, and H. S. Song, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 062330 (2008); Z. Liu and H. Fan, *ibid*. **79**, 032306 (2009); S. Y. Mirafzali, I. Sargolzahi, A. Ahanj, K. Javidan, and M. Sarbishaei, *ibid*. **82**, 032321 (2010).
[36] M. L. Hu and H. Fan, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052311 (2015).
[37] M. S. Byrd and N. Khaneja, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062322 (2003); G. Kimura, Phys. Lett. A **314**, 339 (2003).
[38] See Supplemental Material for proofs of the lemma, theorem, corollaries, and further information.
[39] T. Nakano, M. Piani, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012117 (2013).
[40] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010); S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010); F. M. Paula, T. R. de Oliveira, and M. S. Sarandy, *ibid*. **87**, 064101 (2013).
[41] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 120401 (2011); M. L. Hu and H. Fan, New J. Phys. **17**, 033004 (2015).
[42] L. Chang and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062303 (2013); D. Girolami, T. Tufarelli, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 240402 (2013).
[43] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **200**, 340 (1995).
[44] B. Dakic *et al*., Nat. Phys. **8**, 666 (2012).
[45] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **222**, 21 (1996).

Supplemental Material

Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. As the channel $\mathcal{E}$ gives the map

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi\hat{n}^s) = \chi\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s), \tag{A1}$$

for $\chi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{n}^s = \{n_k\}_{k=k_1,\ldots,k_\alpha}$ ($\alpha \leq d^2-1$) , and the measure $Q(\rho^{\hat{n}}) = Q(\chi\hat{n}^s)$ fulfills

$$Q(\chi\hat{n}^s) = f(\chi)g(\hat{n}^s), \tag{A2}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})] &= Q[\chi\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)] = f(\chi)g[\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)], \\ Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})] &= Q[\chi_p\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)] = f(\chi_p)g[\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)]. \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Hence, it is evident that

$$Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})] = Q(\rho^{\hat{n}})Q[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})], \tag{A4}$$

when $f(\chi_p)g(\hat{n}^s) = 1$ with respect to χ_p is solvable.

If the maximum $Q_{\max} \geqslant 1$, the equation $f(\chi_p)g(\hat{n}^s) = 1$ is always solvable as $f(\chi_p)g(\hat{n}^s) = Q(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})$. If $Q_{\max} < 1$, one can normalize it by simply introducing a constant N such that $Q'_{\max} = NQ_{\max} = 1$. Now, Q' obeys the factorization relation of Eq. (8) in the main text. □

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. First, by using Eq. (4) of the main text and the fact that $\vec{x} = \chi\hat{n}$, we obtain

$$C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}}) = \chi\sum_{r=1}^{d_0}\sqrt{n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2}. \tag{A5}$$

which corresponds to $C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}}) = f(\chi)g(\hat{n}^s)$, with $f(\chi) = \chi$ and $g(\hat{n}^s) = \sum_{r=1}^{d_0}(n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2)^{1/2}$.

Second, when the transformation matrix elements $T_{k0} = 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^2-d\}$, we have

$$x'_k = \chi\sum_{j=1}^{d^2-1} T_{kj}n_j = \chi\mathcal{E}(n_k), \tag{A6}$$

and therefore $\mathcal{E}(\chi\hat{n}^s) = \chi\mathcal{E}(\hat{n}^s)$.

From Eqs. (A5) and (A6) one can see that both the l_1 norm of coherence and the quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ fulfill the requirements of Lemma 1. Thus, the factorization relation (9) of the main text holds.

Moreover, the probe state $\rho_p^{\hat{n}} = \mathbb{I}_d/d + \chi_p\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}/2$, with χ_p being solution of the equation

$$\chi_p g(\hat{n}^s) = 1, \tag{A7}$$

which can be solved as $\chi_p = 1/\sum_{r=1}^{d_0}(n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2)^{1/2}$. This completes the proof. □

Transformation between $\{Y_j\}$ and $\{X_i\}$

We list here the transformation between generators $\{Y_j\}$ for the two-qubit states and $\{X_i\}$ for the qudit states with $d = 4$. They are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1,13} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_1 \pm X_{11}), \\ Y_{2,14} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_2 \pm X_{12}), \\ Y_{4,7} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_3 \pm X_9), \\ Y_{5,10} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_7 \pm X_5), \\ Y_{9,6} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_6 \pm X_8), \\ Y_{8,11} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_4 \pm X_{10}), \\ Y_{12} &= \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}X_{14} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}X_{15}, \\ Y_{3,15} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}X_{13} \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}X_{14} \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}X_{15}, \end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

where we have arranged elements X_i of $\vec{X}$ in the sequence of $\vec{X} = \{u_{12}, v_{12}, u_{13}, v_{13}, \ldots, u_{34}, v_{34}, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, and elements $Y_j = 2^{-1/2}\sigma_{j_1}\otimes\sigma_{j_2}$ of $\vec{Y}$ with $(j_1 j_2)$ in the sequence of (01), (02), (03), (10), (11), (12), (13), …, (33).

Proof of Corollary 4

Proof. First, as the submatrix T^S is rectangular block diagonal, the elements T_{ij} in the off-diagonal blocks are all zero. This, together with $T_{k0} = 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d^2-d\}$, gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned} n'_{2r-1} &= \sum_{j=0}^{d^2-1} T_{2r-1,j}n_j \\ &= T_{2r-1,2r-1}n_{2r-1} + T_{2r-1,2r}n_{2r}, \\ n'_{2r} &= \sum_{j=0}^{d^2-1} T_{2r,j}n_j \\ &= T_{2r,2r-1}n_{2r-1} + T_{2r,2r}n_{2r}, \end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

for $r \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d_0\}$.

Second, the requirement that any 2×2 block T_r^S is an orthogonal matrix, i.e., $(T_r^S)^T T_r^S = \mathbb{I}_2$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} &T_{2r-1,2r-1}^2 + T_{2r,2r-1}^2 = T_{2r-1,2r}^2 + T_{2r,2r}^2 = 1, \\ &T_{2r-1,2r-1}T_{2r-1,2r} + T_{2r,2r-1}T_{2r,2r} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

By combining the above two equations, it is straightforward

to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} n_{2r-1}'^2 + n_{2r}'^2 &= (T_{2r-1,2r-1}^2 + T_{2r,2r-1}^2) n_{2r-1}^2 \\ &\quad + (T_{2r-1,2r}^2 + T_{2r,2r}^2) n_{2r}^2 \\ &\quad + 2(T_{2r-1,2r-1} T_{2r-1,2r} \\ &\quad + T_{2r,2r-1} T_{2r,2r}) n_{2r-1} n_{2r} \\ &= n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

and therefore from Eq. (A5) we have $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p^{\hat{n}})] \equiv 1$. This, together with Theorem 1, implies

$$C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})] = C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}}) \tag{A12}$$

and hence completes the proof. □

From the reasoning in the above proof, it is also worthwhile to note that for the initial quantum states with certain $n_{2r-1} = 0$ (or $n_{2r} = 0$), we have $n_{2r-1}'^2 + n_{2r}'^2 = n_{2r-1}^2 + n_{2r}^2$ when $T_{2r-1,2r}^2 + T_{2r,2r}^2 = 1$ (or $T_{2r-1,2r-1}^2 + T_{2r,2r-1}^2 = 1$), hence the requirement $(T_r^S)^T T_r^S = \mathbb{I}_2$ is relaxed compared with that of the general initial states. Needless to say, when $(T_r^S)^T T_r^S = \mathbb{I}_2$, the coherence is also frozen for states $\rho^{\hat{n}}$ with certain $n_{2r-1} = 0$ or $n_{2r} = 0$.

Frozen quantum coherence of one qubit

We set out to construct quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ under the action of which the l_1 norm of coherence is frozen during the entire evolution. To this end, we let

$$E_i = \sum_{j=0}^{3} \varepsilon_{ij} \sigma_j \ (i \in \{0,1,2,3\}), \tag{A13}$$

be the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{E}$, where $\varepsilon_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$, and their values should satisfy certain constraints such that the requirement of Corollary 4 is satisfied.

First, the completeness condition of the CPTP map, namely, $\sum_i E_i^\dagger E_i = \mathbb{I}$ [1], requires

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_i (|\varepsilon_{i0} + \varepsilon_{i3}|^2 + |\varepsilon_{i1} + i\epsilon_{i2}|^2) = 1, \\ &\sum_i (|\varepsilon_{i0} - \varepsilon_{i3}|^2 + |\varepsilon_{i1} - i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2) = 1, \\ &\sum_i [\mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i0}^* \varepsilon_{i1}) + \mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^* \varepsilon_{i2}) - i\mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i0}^* \varepsilon_{i2}) \\ &\qquad + i\mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^* \varepsilon_{i1})] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A14}$$

where ε_{ij}^* represents conjugation of ε_{ij}, while $\mathrm{Re}(\cdot)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\cdot)$ represent, respectively, the real and imaginary parts of a number, and the notation i before ε_{i2}, $\mathrm{Re}(\cdot)$, and $\mathrm{Im}(\cdot)$ is the imaginary unit.

Second, Corollary 4 requires $T_{10} = T_{20} = 0$, and T^S to be a rectangular block diagonal matrix which corresponds to $T_{13} = T_{23} = 0$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i E_i^\dagger \sigma_1 E_i &= T_{11}\sigma_1 + T_{12}\sigma_2, \\ \sum_i E_i^\dagger \sigma_2 E_i &= T_{21}\sigma_1 + T_{22}\sigma_2, \end{aligned} \tag{A15}$$

from which one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_i \mathrm{Re}[(\varepsilon_{i0} + \varepsilon_{i3})(\varepsilon_{i1}^* - i\varepsilon_{i2}^*)] = 0, \\ &\sum_i \mathrm{Re}[(\varepsilon_{i0}^* - \varepsilon_{i3}^*)(\varepsilon_{i1} - i\varepsilon_{i2})] = 0, \\ &\sum_i \mathrm{Im}[(\varepsilon_{i0} + \varepsilon_{i3})(\varepsilon_{i1}^* - i\varepsilon_{i2}^*)] = 0, \\ &\sum_i \mathrm{Im}[(\varepsilon_{i0}^* - \varepsilon_{i3}^*)(\varepsilon_{i1} - i\varepsilon_{i2})] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A16}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11} &= \sum_i [|\varepsilon_{i0}|^2 + |\varepsilon_{i1}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i2}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i3}|^2], \\ T_{22} &= \sum_i [|\varepsilon_{i0}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i1}|^2 + |\varepsilon_{i2}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i3}|^2], \\ T_{12} &= 2\sum_i [\mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i1}^* \varepsilon_{i2}) - \mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^* \varepsilon_{i0})], \\ T_{21} &= 2\sum_i [\mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i1}^* \varepsilon_{i2}) + \mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^* \varepsilon_{i0})]. \end{aligned} \tag{A17}$$

By comparing Eqs. (A14) and (A16), one can note that the equalities are satisfied when $\varepsilon_{i0} = \varepsilon_{i3} = 0$, $\sum_i |\varepsilon_{i1} + i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2 = \sum_i |\varepsilon_{i1} - i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2 = 1$, or when $\varepsilon_{i1} = \varepsilon_{i2} = 0$, $\sum_i |\varepsilon_{i0} + \varepsilon_{i3}|^2 = \sum_i |\varepsilon_{i0} - \varepsilon_{i3}|^2 = 1$. Under these two constraints, Eq. (A17) simplifies, respectively, to

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11} &= -T_{22} = \sum_i (|\varepsilon_{i1}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i2}|^2), \\ T_{12} &= T_{21} = 2\sum_i \mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i1}^* \varepsilon_{i2}), \end{aligned} \tag{A18}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11} &= T_{22} = \sum_i (|\varepsilon_{i0}|^2 - |\varepsilon_{i3}|^2), \\ T_{12} &= -T_{21} = -2\sum_i \mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^* \varepsilon_{i0}). \end{aligned} \tag{A19}$$

Finally, the requirement that T_r^S should be an orthogonal matrix, i.e., $(T_r^S)^T T_r^S = \mathbb{I}_2$, corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} &|T_{11}|^2 + |T_{21}|^2 = 1, \\ &|T_{12}|^2 + |T_{22}|^2 = 1, \\ &T_{11}^* T_{12} + T_{21}^* T_{22} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A20}$$

then from Eqs. (A18) and (A19), one can see that the equality in the third line of Eq. (A20) is always satisfied, while the equalities in the first two lines are equivalent. Therefore, to

freeze the l_1 norm of quantum coherence, the parameters ε_{ij} should satisfy one of the following two conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon_{i0}=\varepsilon_{i3}=0\ \ (\text{for } i\in\{0,1,2,3\}),\\&\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i1}+i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2=\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i1}-i\varepsilon_{i2}|^2=1,\\&\left[\sum_i(|\varepsilon_{i1}|^2-|\varepsilon_{i2}|^2)\right]^2+4\left[\sum_i\mathrm{Re}(\varepsilon_{i1}^*\varepsilon_{i2})\right]^2=1,\end{aligned}\tag{A21}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon_{i1}=\varepsilon_{i2}=0\ (\text{for } i\in\{0,1,2,3\}),\\&\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i0}+\varepsilon_{i3}|^2=\sum_i|\varepsilon_{i0}-\epsilon_{i3}|^2=1,\\&\left[\sum_i(|\varepsilon_{i0}|^2-|\varepsilon_{i3}|^2)\right]^2+4\left[\sum_i\mathrm{Im}(\varepsilon_{i3}^*\varepsilon_{i0})\right]^2=1\end{aligned}\tag{A22}$$

By Eqs. (A21) and (A22), one can construct a host of quantum channels $\mathcal{E}$ under the action of which the l_1 norm of coherence for the one-qubit states is frozen. For instance, when $\varepsilon_{01}=q(t)$, $\varepsilon_{02}=\pm\sqrt{1-q^2(t)}$, and $\varepsilon_{i1}=\varepsilon_{i2}=0$ ($i\in\{1,2,3\}$), or when $\varepsilon_{00}=q(t)$, $\varepsilon_{03}=\pm i\sqrt{1-q^2(t)}$, and $\varepsilon_{i0}=\varepsilon_{i3}=0$ ($i\in\{1,2,3\}$), we always have $C_{l_1}[\mathcal{E}(\rho^{\hat{n}})]=C_{l_1}(\rho^{\hat{n}})$. Here, $q(t)$ is a time-dependent parameter containing information on $\mathcal{E}$ and its coupling with the system.

Other measures fulfilling the factorization relation

Apart from the l_1 norm of coherence, another quantifier fulfilling the requirement of Lemma 1 is $\mathcal{P}(\rho)$ which is a monotonic function of the purity $P(\rho)=\mathrm{Tr}\rho^2$ of a state

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho)=P(\rho)-\frac{1}{d}=\frac{1}{2}|\vec{x}|^2.\tag{A23}$$

In analogy to Eq. (8), here we have

$$\mathcal{P}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)]=\mathcal{P}(\rho)\mathcal{P}[\mathcal{E}(\rho_p)],\tag{A24}$$

with ρ_p bing the probe state for which $|\vec{x}_p|=\sqrt{2}$.

Even for bipartite states, there are quantum property measures fulfilling the requirement of Lemma 1, hence the factorization relation (8) holds for them. Examples of this kind of measures encompass the discord-like correlations, such as the geometric quantum discord defined via the Schatten 2-norm (i.e., the Hilbert-Schmidt norm) [2] and the Schatten 1-norm [3], which are given, respectively, by

$$D_2(\rho)=2\min_{\Pi^A}\parallel\rho-\Pi^A(\rho)\parallel_2^2,\tag{A25}$$

and

$$D_1(\rho)=\min_{\Pi^A}\parallel\rho-\Pi^A(\rho)\parallel_1,\tag{A26}$$

as well as the measurement-induced nonlocality based on the Schatten 2-norm [4] and the Schatten 1-norm [5], which are given, respectively, by

$$N_2(\rho)=2\max_{\Pi^A}\parallel\rho-\Pi^A(\rho)\parallel_2^2,\tag{A27}$$

and

$$N_1(\rho)=\max_{\Pi^A}\parallel\rho-\Pi^A(\rho)\parallel_1,\tag{A28}$$

where $||\varrho||_p=[\mathrm{Tr}(\varrho^\dagger\varrho)^{p/2}]^{1/p}$ is the Schatten p-norm, and $\Pi^A=\{\Pi_k^A\}$ is the set of projective measurements on subsystem A. As $\sum_k(\Pi_k^A\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)\mathbb{I}_{AB}(\Pi_k^A\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)=\sum_k(\Pi_k^A\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)^2=\mathbb{I}_{AB}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}||\rho-\Pi^A(\rho)||_p&=\frac{1}{2}\parallel\chi\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}-\Pi^A(\chi\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X})\parallel_p,\\&=\frac{1}{2}\chi\parallel\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}-\Pi^A(\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X})\parallel_p,\end{aligned}\tag{A29}$$

and therefore by comparing with Lemma 1, we have $f(\chi)=\chi/2$, and $g(\hat{n}^s)=g(\hat{n})=\mathrm{opt}_{\Pi^A}\parallel\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X}-\Pi^A(\hat{n}\cdot\vec{X})\parallel_p$, with $\mathrm{opt}\in\{\max,\min\}$.

Similarly, the Hellinger distance discord defined based on the square root of the density operator ρ [42], i.e.,

$$D_H(\rho)=\min_{\Pi^A}\parallel\sqrt{\rho}-\Pi^A(\sqrt{\rho})\parallel_2^2,\tag{A30}$$

also fulfill the requirement of Lemma 1 as $\sqrt{\rho}$ can be decomposed as $\sqrt{\rho}=\sum_{ij}\gamma_{ij}X_i^A\otimes X_j^B$, with $\{X_i^A\}_{i=0,1,\ldots,d_A}$ and $\{X_j^B\}_{j=0,1,\ldots,d_B}$ being the sets of Hermitian operators which constitute an orthonormal operator bases for the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ ($d_{A,B}=\dim\mathcal{H}_{A<B}$), and $\sum_k(\Pi_k^A\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)(X_0^A\otimes X_0^B)(\Pi_k^A\otimes\mathbb{I}_B)=X_0^A\otimes X_0^B$.

Moreover, when considering the two-qubit states, the maximum Bell-inequality violation $B_{\max}(\rho)$ [43], the remote state preparation fidelity $F_{\mathrm{rsp}}(\rho)$ [44], and $N_{\mathrm{qt}}(\rho)$ which is a monotonic function of the average teleportation fidelity $F_{\mathrm{qt}}(\rho)=1/2+N_{\mathrm{qt}}(\rho)/6$ [45], given, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned}B_{\max}(\rho)&=2\sqrt{E_1+E_2},\\F_{\mathrm{rsp}}(\rho)&=\frac{1}{2}(E_2+E_3),\\N_{\mathrm{qt}}(\rho)&=\sqrt{E_1+E_2+E_3},\end{aligned}\tag{A31}$$

also satisfy the requirement of Lemma 1, thus the factorization relation (8) holds. Here, $E_1\geqslant E_2\geqslant E_3$ are the eigenvalues of $T^\dagger T$, with T being a 3×3 matrix, and $T_{ij}=\mathrm{Tr}(\rho\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j)$, $\sigma_{1,2,3}$ are the usual Pauli operators.

* Electronic address: mingliang0301@163.com
† Electronic address: hfan@iphy.ac.cn

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).

[2] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010); S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).
[3] F. M. Paula, T. R. de Oliveira, and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 064101 (2013).
[4] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 120401 (2011).
[5] M. L. Hu and H. Fan, New J. Phys. **17**, 033004 (2015).
[6] L. Chang and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062303 (2013); D. Girolami, T. Tufarelli, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 240402 (2013).
[7] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **200**, 340 (1995).
[8] B. Dakic *et al*., Nat. Phys. **8**, 666 (2012).
[9] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **222**, 21 (1996).